



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/538,871

08/18/2005

Thomas Leucht

GAS-009

8789

32628

7590

09/24/2007

KANESAKA BERNER AND PARTNERS LLP
1700 DIAGONAL RD
SUITE 310
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2848

EXAMINER

DAVIS, JENNA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/538,871	Applicant(s) LEUCHT ET AL.	
	Examiner Terrel H. Morris	Art Unit 1771	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Terrel H. Morris. (3)_____.

(2) Eliot Malamd. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 20 September 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Marx and Nozaki.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the limitations of the claims, the similarity of the flame retardant compositions of the prior art to that claimed. Pointed out how neither reference discusses intumescent materials. Discussed how the rejection of the examiner seems to recite a motivation found only in applicant's Spec and how applicant's spec indicates that the presence of the melamine is key to producing the desired effect of intumescence in the claimed system.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Terrel Morris/
SPE, 1771

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required